

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference JSONY-723PCT		Date of mailing (day/month/year)
		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below
International application No. PCT/JP2005/016136	International filing date (day/month/year) 02.09.2005	Priority date (day/month/year) 08.09.2004
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC		
Applicant SONY CORPORATION		

1.	This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
2.	FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.	
3.	For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.	

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP	Date of completion of this opinion	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.		Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/016136

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - ☒ the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - ☐ the translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rule 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - ☐ on paper
 - ☐ in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in electronic form
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/016136

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	4-8	YES
	Claims	1-3	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-8	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-8	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP, 2002-182784, A (Toshiba Corp.), 26 June, 2002 (26.06.02), full text, all drawings
(Family: none)

Document 2: JP, 2002-124226, A (NEC Corp.), 26 April, 2002 (26.04.02), full text, all drawings
(Family: none)

The subject matters of claims 1-3 do not appear to be novel or to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 cited in the ISR. The "operating part" described in claim 1 is disclosed in the "group of switches 34a, b, c, d" and "switches 35, 36" of document 1.

The subject matter of claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. The inventions of documents 1 and 2 have the same technical problem in mounting a battery pack in a notebook personal computer. A person skilled in the art could have easily conceived of applying the means of "storing a part of the battery storing unit of a battery pack between a pair of hinge sections" described in document 2 to the invention of document 1 to solve the common technical problem.

The subject matter of claim 5 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of documents 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. It is merely a matter of design variation to dispose the dry-cell battery pack control circuit of document 2 in a position in which a group of switches of document 1 are avoided in applying the above means to the invention of document 1.

The subject matters of claims 6 and 7 do not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 and 2 cited in the ISR. It is merely a matter of design variation to store the dry-cell battery pack control circuit of document 2 between the hinge devices of document 1 in applying the above means to the invention of document 1 and 2.

The subject matter of claim 8 does not appear to involve an inventive step in view of document 1 cited in the ISR. Document 1 suggests that the system status of a computer is displayed in a sub-display which exists in a direction in which a group of switches are disposed (paragraph [0020], etc.). Therefore, a person skilled in the art could have easily conceived of using a well-known power-supply lamp instead of using this display.